



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,301	10/11/2001	Steve Grove	2043.053US1	1851
49845	7590	09/13/2007	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/EBAY			ENGLAND, DAVID E	
P.O. BOX 2938				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2143	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/13/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@SLWIP.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/976,301	GROVE, STEVE
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David E. England	2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/11/2007 *PC*
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 48 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed 06/11/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 – 48 under 103 rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Flanagan and Gastaldo.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3 – 5, 9 – 12, 14 – 16, 20 – 23, 25 – 27, 31 – 34, 36 – 38 and 42 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan et al. (5966685) (hereinafter Flanagan) in view of Gastaldo et al. (6473729), (hereinafter Gastaldo).

5. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches a method to facilitate translation of communications between entities over a network, said method

comprising:

6. identifying a translated language construct corresponding to said selected language

construct, said identifying based on entity information relating to a second entity and said

selected language construct, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36); and

7. communicating said translated language construct to said second entity as a second

transmission over said network, said translated language construct is a translation of said

predetermined question that is identified responsive to receipt of said selection by said first

entity, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36, Translating the question “What?” or

“Who”). Although, Flanagan could teach one word questions or phrases, multiword phrases are

not specifically stated as being predetermined.

8. Flanagan does not specifically teach communicating a plurality of predetermined

language constructs to a first entity;

9. responsive to receipt of a selection by said first entity of a language construct of said

plurality of predetermined language constructs;

10. said selected language construct is predetermined setup that is requested by said first

entity.

11. Gastaldo teaches teach communicating a plurality of predetermined language constructs

to a first entity, (e.g., Figures 5 – 7 and supporting text);

12. responsive to receipt of a selection by said first entity of a language construct of said

plurality of predetermined language constructs, (e.g., Figures 5 – 7 and supporting text);

Art Unit: 2143

13. said selected language construct is predetermined setup that is requested by said first entity, (e.g., Figures 5 – 7 and supporting text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gastaldo with Flanagan because utilizing predetermined phrases in a database situation could aid in a faster translation since no real “translation” is occurring, i.e. verbs, nouns and other grammatical instances do not need to be considered all that is needed is the relational IDs between the two fields.

14. Although Flanagan and Gastaldo do not explicitly teach the use of a question, it is well known in the art and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claimed invention is only linking fields in a database and it would make no difference if what was being “translated” was a question or a statement.

15. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches retrieving said entity information relating to said second entity based on an identifier of said second entity selected by said first entity, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

16. Flanagan does not teach retrieving said translated language construct from a table based on said entity information and said selected language construct. Gastaldo teaches retrieving said translated language construct from a table based on said entity information and said selected language construct, (e.g., Figures 5 – 7 and supporting text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gastaldo with Flanagan because of similar reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

17. As to claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches said entity information further comprises a language preference of said second entity, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

18. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches said predetermined setup is requested by said first entity in an electronic commerce transaction over said network, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36). Although Flanagan and Gastaldo do not explicitly teach the use of a question, it is well known in the art and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claimed invention is only linking fields in a database and it would make no difference if what was being “translated” was a question or a statement.

19. Referencing claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches said translated language construct is generated and stored, and said correspondence to said selected language construct is defined, prior to communication of said plurality of language constructs to said first entity as said first transmission, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

20. Referencing claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches a network-based transaction facility, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

21. Flanagan does not specifically teach storing said plurality of predetermined language constructs and an associated plurality of translated language constructs so as to define a correspondence between each language construct of said plurality of predetermined language constructs and at least one associated translated language construct of said plurality of translated

language constructs. Gastaldo teaches storing said plurality of predetermined language constructs and an associated plurality of translated language constructs so as to define a correspondence between each language construct of said plurality of predetermined language constructs and at least one associated translated language construct of said plurality of translated language constructs, (e.g., Figures 5 – 7 and supporting text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gastaldo with Flanagan because of similar reasons stated above.

22. Referencing claim 11, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan does not specifically teach teaches said storing is so as to define a correspondence between a set of said plurality of translated language constructs, each translated language construct of said set comprising a predetermined translation of a common underlying language construct.

23. Gastaldo teaches said storing is so as to define a correspondence between a set of said plurality of translated language constructs, each translated language construct of said set comprising a predetermined translation of a common underlying language construct, (e.g., Figures 5 – 7 and supporting text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gastaldo with Flanagan because of similar reasons stated above.

24. Claims 12, 14 – 16, 20 – 23, 25 – 27, 31 – 34, 36 – 38 and 42 – 45 are rejected for similar reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

25. Claims 2, 6, 7, 13, 17, 18, 24, 28, 29, 35, 39, 40 and 46 – 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan and Gastaldo in further view of Scanlan (6857022).

26. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan and Gastaldo do not specifically teach communicating a plurality of interactive fields to said second entity in said second transmission to allow said second entity to interact with at least one interactive field of said plurality of interactive fields in response to said translated language construct. Scanlan teaches communicating a plurality of interactive fields to said second entity in said second transmission to allow said second entity to interact with at least one interactive field of said plurality of interactive fields in response to said translated language construct, (e.g. col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Scanlan with the combine inventions of Flanagan and Gastaldo with because utilizing a drop down menu allows the user to not type information into the system and possibly mistyping information, causing errors in the system.

27. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan and Gastaldo do not specifically teach said first transmission is a Hyper Text Markup Language (HTIP) message. Scanlan teaches said first transmission is a Hyper Text Markup Language (HTIP) message, (e.g., col. 1, lines 17 – 38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Scanlan with the combine inventions of Flanagan and Gastaldo because it would be obvious that in a communication with a web server that the first communication would be a type of HTTP message.

28. As to claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan and Gastaldo do not specifically teach said second transmission is an electronic mail message. Scanlan teaches said second transmission is an electronic mail message, (e.g. col. 6, lines 31 – 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Scanlan with the combine inventions of Flanagan and Gastaldo because of similar reasons stated above, also utilizing email gives users the ability to communicate with other users across a network.

29. As per claim 46, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches all that is similar to claim 46 as taught in claims 1 and 45 above. Furthermore, Scanlan teaches interactive fields as taught above. Similarly reasons for combining are also found above.

30. As per claim 47, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan does not specifically teach said plurality of interactive fields includes a first interactive field, wherein said first interactive field includes a drop down list that contains a second plurality of predetermined language constructs that respectively translated into a second language based on a language preference of said second entity.

31. Gastaldo teaches said plurality of interactive fields includes a first interactive field, wherein said first interactive field includes a drop down list that contains a second plurality of predetermined language constructs that respectively translated into a second language based on a language preference, (e.g., Figures 5 – 7 and supporting text). It would have been obvious to one

Art Unit: 2143

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Gastaldo with Flanagan because of similar reasons stated above.

32. Scanlan teaches of said second entity that will receive the email with the translated language, (e.g. col. 6, lines 31 – 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Scanlan with the combine inventions of Flanagan and Gastaldo because of similar reasons stated above.

33. As per claim 48, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan and Gastaldo do not specifically teach receiving a reply message from said second entity that includes a selection of the said second entity from said first interactive field, said selection of the second entity including a response from said second entity to said predetermined question that is asked by said first entity. Scanlan teaches receiving a reply message from said second entity that includes a selection of the said second entity from said first interactive field, said selection of the second entity including a response from said second entity to said predetermined question that is asked by said first entity, (e.g. col. 6, lines 31 – 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Scanlan with the combine inventions of Flanagan and Gastaldo because of similar reasons stated above.

34. Claims 13, 17, 18, 24, 28, 29, 35, 39 and 40 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2143

35. Claims 8, 19, 30 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan and Gastaldo in view of Christy (6301554).

36. As to claim 8, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan and Gastaldo do not specifically teach said identifier of said second entity is an electronic mail address of said second entity. Christy teaches said identifier of said second entity is an electronic mail address of said second entity, (e.g. col. 2, line 47 – col. 3, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Christy with the combine inventions of Flanagan and Appleby because of similar reasons stated above. Furthermore, in an email system, in order to send a message, one must have a type of identifier, “an address”, or the email cannot be sent.

37. Claims 19, 30 and 41 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

DE



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100